



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/605,544	06/29/2000	Colin S. Cole	3797.86783	8016

28319 7590 01/29/2004

BANNER & WITCOFF LTD.,
ATTORNEYS FOR MICROSOFT
1001 G STREET, N.W.
ELEVENTH STREET
WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4597

EXAMINER

CHOUDHARY, ANITA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2153

DATE MAILED: 01/29/2004

13

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/605,544

Applicant(s)

COLE ET AL.

Examiner

Anita Choudhary

Art Unit

2153

– The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address –
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 November 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 29 June 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed November 11, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In referring to claims 1, 6-10, 16, 17, 19, 20, and 22, Applicant's argues that the reference shown by Hughes (US 6,122,372) does not teach or suggest "creating" an object. The Office disagrees with this assertion. The mere limitation of "creating" a message object is not a novel concept. Hughes may not use the word "creating" a message object, however Hughes takes substantial steps for carrying out a means for creating a message object from an incoming encapsulated message. Hughes teaches parsing, accepting, interpreting, and acknowledging an incoming encapsulated message (col. 6 lines 1-5). In carrying out these steps a message object is "created" that can be understood and acted upon by the receiving station. The "creating of an object (transaction message fig. 4b, 4c) from the data file (encapsulated message, fig. 2) with a plug-in object (template, protocol, and contract) corresponding to a predetermined schema (template CNS ID)" is clearly in the scope of invention shown by Hughes. For example, raw message converter 408, col. 12 lines 61- col. 13 line 7. Hughes teaches the limitation required by claim 1.

In referring to claims, 12-15, Applicant argues that the reference shown by Lektion et al. (US 6,446,110) does not teach both "a data field containing data file" and "a data field containing manifest information." The Office disagrees with this assertion. Lektion shows data fields characterized by data elements for screen information and session information (<session>

Art Unit: 2153

</session>, <screen> </screen>, col. 9 lines 15-17). Each data element, session and screen fields, contains a data file (XML data) in accordance to a schema (see fig. 13A-13C). A data field (screen and session element) contains manifest information (sub-elements: idtype, description, host port, size, content, interaction, and display, see fig. 13A) corresponding to information in the data file data field (screen and session elements). The sub-elements, listed above, function to name and describe an image for screen presentation. As Applicant had earlier defined, “manifest information” may include description of a document (see Paper 7, page 13).
Lecture teaches the limitation required of claim 12.

The previous rejection has been repeated below and should be seen in light of the Response to Applicants’ Arguments shown above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1, 6-10, 16, 17, 19, 20 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,122,372 to Hughes (hereinafter “Hughes”).

In considering claim 1, Hughes discloses a method for exchanging data between a source location and a destination location (column 5, lines 39-41) comprising:

Art Unit: 2153

generating a data file with a markup language in accordance with a predetermined schema (column 8, lines 35-39);

generating a first software envelope containing the data file (column 6, lines 6-14);

transmitting the data file software envelope to the destination location (column 5, lines 64-67 – column 6, lines 1-5); and

creating an object from the data file with a plug-in object corresponding to the predetermined schema (column 9, lines 25-32).

In considering claim 6, 19, and 22, Hughes further discloses wherein the markup language comprises standard generalized markup language (SGML) (column 8, lines 35-39).

In considering claim 7, Hughes further discloses wherein the step of transmitting comprises transmitting the software envelope via electronic mail (column 8, lines 43-44).

In considering claim 8, Hughes further discloses wherein the step of transmitting comprises transmitting the software envelope via HTTP (column 8, lines 43-45; Note that it is inherent that HTML is sent via HTTP).

In considering claim 9, Hughes further discloses wherein the step of transmitting comprises transmitting the software envelope via an intermediate server (column 5, lines 48-52).

In considering claim 10, Hughes further discloses a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions for performing the steps recited in claim 1 (Note that it is inherent that in order to perform the method steps there must be a computer-readable medium with computer-executable instructions.).

In considering claim 16, Hughes discloses a method for creating data at a source location to transmit to a destination location (column 5, lines 39-41), comprising the steps of:

generating a data file with a markup language in accordance with a predetermined schema (column 8, lines 35-39);

generating a software envelope containing the data file (column 6, lines 6-14);

identifying a plug-in object that creates an object from the data file (column 9, lines 25-32); and

transmitting the software envelope to the destination location (column 5, lines 64-67 – column 6, lines 1-5).

In considering claim 17, Hughes further discloses wherein generating a software envelope containing the data file (column 6, lines 6-14) and the plug-in object (column 9, lines 25-32).

In considering claim 20, Hughes discloses a method for extracting data from a file transmitted from a source location, comprising the steps of:

receiving a software envelope containing a data file marked up with a markup language in accordance with a predetermined schema (column 5, lines 64-67 – column 6, lines 1-5); and

creating an object from the data file with a plug-in object corresponding to the predetermined schema (column 9, lines 25-32).

3. Claims 12-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,446,110 to Lektion et al. (hereinafter “Lektion”).

In considering claim 12, Lektion discloses a computer-readable medium having stored thereon a data structure comprising:

a data field containing address information (see column 9, line 19 (“host port number”));

Art Unit: 2153

a data field containing the identification of a predetermined schema (see column 9, lines 4-6);

a data field containing a data file formatted with a markup language in accordance with the schema (see column 9, lines 7-9); and

a data field containing manifest information corresponding to the information contained in the data file data field (see column 9, lines 7-9 and 22-30).

In considering claim 13, Lektion et al. further discloses a data field containing state information (see column 9, lines 16-18).

In considering claim 14, Lektion et al. further discloses wherein the state information contains address information (see column 9, line 19 (“host port number”)).

In considering claim 15, Lektion et al. further discloses wherein the address information contains an address for replying to a message (see Fig. 4; Note that the double arrows show that the datastreams are going in both directions between the source and destination and therefore the address information must contain an address for replying to the datastream message in order for it to be transmitted back to the host.).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 5, 18 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hughes in view of Lektion.

Art Unit: 2153

In considering claims 5, 18 and 21 Hughes fails to disclose *wherein the markup language comprises extensible markup language (XML)*. Nonetheless this feature is well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification to the system disclosed by Hughes, as evidenced by Lektion. Lektion discloses that the markup language of the data file comprises extensible markup language (column 6, lines 34-35). A person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying the system disclosed by Hughes by incorporating this well known feature, such as disclosed by Lektion, in order to allow for greater flexibility in organizing and presenting information in the data file.

6. Claims 2-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hughes in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,507,856 to Chen et al (hereinafter "Chen").

In considering claim 2, Hughes fails to disclose *automatically generating a second software envelope from the information contained in the first software envelope*. Nonetheless, this feature is well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification to the system disclosed by Hughes, as evidenced by Chen. In an analogous art Chen discloses a system for exchanging messages over a network including automatically generating a second software envelope from the information contained in the first software envelope (column 3, lines 50-60). A person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying the system disclosed by Hughes by incorporating this well known feature, such as disclosed by Chen, in order to allow for greater efficiency when transferring a document back to the original destination.

In considering claim 3, Hughes further discloses wherein the first software envelope contains destination and source address information (Fig. 2, "210" and "214") however it fails to

Art Unit: 2153

disclose *generating a second envelope having a destination address matching the source address of the first envelope*. Nonetheless, this feature is well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification to the system disclosed by Hughes, as evidenced by Chen. In an analogous art Chen discloses a system for exchanging messages over a network including generating a second envelope having a destination address matching the source address of the first envelope (column 3, lines 50-60). A person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying the system disclosed by Hughes by incorporating this well known feature, such as disclosed by Chen for the reasons cited above with respect to claim 2.

In considering claim 4, Hughes further discloses wherein the first software envelope contains state information (Fig. 2) however it fails to disclose *generating a second envelope having a destination address determined by the state information*. Nonetheless, this feature is well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification to the system disclosed by Hughes, as evidenced by Chen. In an analogous art Chen discloses a system for exchanging messages over a network including generating a second software envelope having a destination address determined by the state information (column 3, lines 50-60). A person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying the system disclosed by Hughes by incorporating this well known feature, such as disclosed by Chen, for the reasons cited above with respect to claim 2.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anita Choudhary whose telephone number is (703) 305-5268. The examiner can normally be reached on 9am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenton Burgess can be reached on (703) 305-4792. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 746-7239.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

AC
January 21, 2004


GLENTON B. BURGESS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100